

conception of our mission among men, by Catholicity of sympathy with the rights and the needs of men, by Catholic zeal for suffering humanity, by a Catholic consecration to the work of converting men to God and uplifting them to fellowship with Jesus Christ, through the preaching of the gospel and the ministration of the sacraments.

Extract from the Last Will of Bishop Cosin, one of the Anglo-Catholic divines, December 11, 1671:

"In what of the world soever any Churches are extant bearing the name of Christ, and professing the true Catholic faith and religion, worshipping and calling upon God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, with one heart and voice,—if I be now hindered actually to join with them, either by distance of countries, or variance amongst men, or by any hindrance whatsoever; yet always in my mind and affection I join and unite with them;—which I desire to be chiefly understood of Protestants and the best reformed Churches."

Is the Episcopal Church Catholic or is it Protestant?

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED IN THE
CHURCH OF THE SAVIOUR, PHILADEL-
PHIA, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1916, IN
ANSWER TO THE CHALLENGE OF BISHOP
ANDERSON AND BISHOP KINSMAN

BY THE REVEREND
RANDOLPH HARRISON McKIM, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.



On Sale by
GEORGE W. JACOBS & CO.
1628 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia
1916

PRICE TEN CENTS
\$1 per dozen, postpaid

A Declaration and Testimony

ADOPTED BY

The Church League of the Protestant Episcopal Church

at a large Conference held in Holy Trinity Parish House,
Philadelphia, on March 1, 1916

"Issuing from the Reformation without the loss of her ancient heritage, and baptized afresh in the spirit of the New Testament, the character of our Church became what is now revealed in her name—the Protestant Episcopal Church.

"Confident in her possession of the historic creeds and maintaining her ancient ministry, comprehensiveness became her great characteristic.

"So much that is alien to her history and spirit is now being set forth in her name that loyalty demands of her sons a clear declaration of their allegiance.

"First.—We assert, therefore, our allegiance to the following principles:

"1. The sufficiency of the one sacrifice of Christ, and his sole mediatorship with God.

"2. The sacred right of the individual soul to an immediate approach to God in Christ.

"3. The supremacy of the enlightened conscience in the individual life as the final court of appeal.

"4. The supremacy of holy scripture as the test and warrant of Christian doctrine.

"Secondly.—We affirm our loyalty to the following truths, which are clearly indicated in the formularies of the church:

"1. The sacraments as the two alone ordained by Christ himself.

"2. The presence of Christ in the life of humanity, realized in experience and most tenderly realized, by faith, in the feast of His own appointment.

"3. The continuity of the ministry by an historic method as a fact of signal value and authority, and independent of any theories that may be imposed upon it.

"Thirdly.—In the face of the present demand, openly expressed by bishops and others, that our Church declare herself that there may be no mistake in her position, we affirm:

"1. This Church has declared herself on these points, historically, specifically and unequivocally.

"2. This Church's unique conception of comprehensiveness cannot be nullified by the effort to include what she has definitely excluded.

"3. This Church has made confident declaration of her position as a result of her belief in the guidance of the Holy Spirit and as a consequence of the characteristic use of sound learning.

"In no spirit of partisanship, but in simple loyalty to the church of which we are members, we invite all persons who, like ourselves, would preserve inviolate the heritage of Catholic and Protestant truth which is embodied in the standards of our church, to associate themselves with us in membership in the *Church League of the Protestant Episcopal Church* for the purpose of upholding and defending that sacred inheritance."

The following Resolution was also unanimously adopted:

"We, the members of the Church League of the Protestant Episcopal Church, believing in the fundamental principles of New Testament Christianity as expressed in the Creeds and in the Prayer Book and as re-affirmed and vindicated by the English Reformation, invite all churchmen to join with us in an educational campaign for the maintenance of these principles and in opposition to certain mediaeval and Romanizing tendencies within our Church which have been distinctively repudiated by this Church."

Is the Episcopal Church Catholic or is it Protestant?

*An Answer to the Challenge of Bishop Anderson
and Bishop Kinsman.*

It is a significant fact that two of our bishops, one of a diocese in the middle West, the other of an Eastern diocese, have recently declared that the issue before the Episcopal Church at the present moment is this, "*Is the Church Catholic or is it Protestant?*"

This utterance has peculiar significance, not only because in each case it was made publicly and deliberately, but also because it was made almost simultaneously by two bishops who are understood to represent the so-called Catholic party. What it signifies is evidently this—that this party has decided that the issue on which they mean to fight their battle is the Protestant issue.

We, on our part, are ready to meet them on this, their chosen ground. We gladly take up the challenge, and are confident of the result of the combat.

The Bishop of Delaware says: "The issue, Catholic or Protestant, is before us," and he adds, "We must all deal with it, with Christian gentleness, with the sole motive of loyalty to truth and to our Lord."

With this we heartily agree, and shall keep before us in all we have to say, "*loyalty to truth and to our Lord.*" We shall also bear in mind the following utterances of the Bishop just referred to: "Protestantism quite normally leads to

Unitarianism." "The basis of Protestantism was . . . a protest against the supernatural." "In the end God has to go." "Hence it is that one of our bishops could say recently, 'The goal of Protestantism is Atheism.'" ("The Issues before the Church," p. 19.)

The Bishop of Chicago says, "Broadly speaking, there are two groups of Christian Churches, Catholic and Protestant. The Episcopal Church, historically, structurally, theologically, belongs to the Catholic group." ("The Panama Congress," p. 9.) He also says, "When, oh when, shall we get done with these slippery compromises? . . . Let us be fish, flesh or fowl. If the Episcopal Church is fundamentally Catholic, let us govern ourselves accordingly. If it is fundamentally Non-Catholic, let us do likewise. But in the name of consistency let us get done with this acrobatic business of riding two horses at the same time." (*Id.*, p. 13.)

Before entering on the subject let me call attention to an utterance of our Lord which has an important bearing on the topic which I propose to discuss. I refer to the words He addressed to Pilate:

"To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." (John XVIII, 37.) Now, when we turn to the original we find that the Greek word for "bear witness" (*μαρτυρέω*) is the equivalent of the Latin "protestor," from which our word "Protestant" is derived, and which means "to bear solemn witness," and this is the definition given in the Century Dictionary of the verb "to protest," viz., "to make a solemn declaration, or affirmation; to bear witness or testimony to; to assert." We note also that the witness-bearing of the Apostles is described frequently in the Book of Acts by the compound of the same word our Saviour used to Pilate, *διαμαρτύρομαι*—a word which means "to solemnly

affirm," "to call God and man to witness" (the very thing the Protestant princes did at Speyer), and this is rendered in the Vulgate (Acts XX, 23) by the Latin word "protestari." Thus, etymologically, both in Latin and Greek, the word "Protestant" is one of affirmation, not of negation. A Protestant Church is a Church that bears witness for the truth. So much by way of introduction.

Now the thesis which I propose to defend is this: *This Church is a Protestant Church and ought so to continue.* I. Let me give some reasons for the affirmation that this Church is a Protestant Church.

1. My first reason is this: Since the preface to the Prayer Book declares that "this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline or worship"; and since the General Convention of 1814 declared that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is "the same body heretofore known in these States by the name of the Church of England," therefore, if the Church of England is a Protestant Church, it follows necessarily that this Church of ours is a Protestant Church.

But is the Church of England a Protestant Church? There are some who deny that it is. What, then, are the facts in the case?

The Church of England was established in Britain very early in the Christian era, but it was reformed and reconstituted at the time of the Reformation, about the middle of the sixteenth century. Turn your eyes, then, to the reign of Edward VI, and subsequently to the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and you find the most influential churchmen speaking of the religion of their Church as "the Protestant religion,"—such men as Bishop Ridley, Bishop Matthew Parker, Archbishop

Whitgift and Bishop Jewel. In the next century we hear King Charles I speaking of "the Protestant Church established in England"; and Charles II, later, echoing his words. We hear Archbishop Laud at the height of his power in 1622, and again in 1645, when he stood on the scaffold, asserting his loyalty to "the Protestant religion as established in England." We hear the English Parliament in both Houses, in the month of May, 1641, requiring every member of the House to promise to "maintain and defend" "the true reformed Protestant faith expressed in the doctrine of the Church of England."

We open the statute book of the British Parliament, and we find the Protestantism of the Church solemnly affirmed in various acts—for example, in 1660, in 1677, in 1688, in 1706, in 1711, in 1791, in 1880, in 1829, in 1842. We enter the Houses of Parliament in 1829 and listen to the great debate on "Catholic Emancipation," and we hear the Church of England described as Protestant, by archbishops, bishops, jurists and statesmen without distinction; and as we listen to these debates and read these Acts of Parliament, we recall the fact that for a long period none but churchmen were members of Parliament; that at that date (1829) the vast majority of the members of Parliament were churchmen; and that about twenty members of the House of Lords were bishops of the Church.

Again we find the Protestantism of the Church of England affirmed by judicial opinion, for example, in 1791 and in 1840. Yet again we find the Protestant character of the Church of England affirmed by a long line of her most illustrious divines from Queen Elizabeth's time down to the middle of the nineteenth century. And what is especially noteworthy is that the highest of the high churchmen among these divines formed no exception to the sentiment just alluded to. The

Anglo-Catholic divines, as they have been called, such men as Bishop Cosin, Archbishop Bramhall, Bishop Morton, Bishop Bull, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Bishop Andrewes and Archbishop Laud, all maintained its Protestant character. The same thing was affirmed by the Convocation of Canterbury, in the year 1689, when it used the following language: "We doubt not the interest of the Protestant religion in all other Protestant churches will be the better secured"—where the phrase "other Protestant churches," necessarily implies that the Church of England was a Protestant Church. I call your attention also to the fact that the Protestantism of the Church of England has been plainly affirmed, not only in the abjuration oath taken by the clergy ever since the Revolution, but in the Coronation oath taken by the kings and queens of England for centuries. Finally, let me say that the Protestant character of the Church of England pervades whole libraries of the standard controversial literature of that Church.

In the face of all these facts there are, nevertheless, some among us who deny that the Church of England is a Protestant Church. One can only ask, is it not strange, passing strange, incomprehensible in fact, that her kings, her archbishops, her bishops, her great doctors, her judges, her House of Commons, her House of Lords, for the space of three hundred years never discovered that important fact, but went on speaking of their Church as a Protestant Church? Is it not strange, too, that the compilers of the Prayer Book did not discover it? Cranmer, and Ridley and Latimer, when they went to the stake rather than acknowledge the doctrine of the Mass, thought they were making a protest against the Church of Rome; they revised the Church service so as to eliminate the distinctive doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, and yet, forsooth, they were not Protestants!—

though they thought so, even as their souls went up to God in the flames!

Strange, passing strange, again, that the compilers of our Articles did not know the Church of England was not Protestant when they wrote those strong condemnations of the chief doctrines of the Church of Rome, in such striking harmony with the Augsburg Confession, the most conspicuous of the Protestant standards! Strange, yet again, that the leading theologians of the reign of Queen Elizabeth did not discover that the Church of England was not Protestant! And mark you, this strange phenomenon was repeated generation after generation till the middle of the nineteenth century. Then some people, under the spell of John Henry Newman, began for the first time to find out that the English Church was not Protestant.

I have shown that the Church established in England was universally held to be a Protestant Church for centuries.

The Church in the American Colonies Let me now point out that the same opinion prevailed in the American Colonies prior to the Revolution. I could give many quotations in affirmation of this—in the Colony of Maryland, in the Colony of Pennsylvania, and in the Colony of New York. It is sufficient to quote the charter of Trinity Church, New York, granted May 6, 1697, in which the expression, "Protestant Church of England," is repeated at least five times, and in which it is made obligatory that the clergyman in charge of Trinity Parish should always be "a good sufficient Protestant minister."

2. My second reason for maintaining the Protestant character of the Church of which we are members, is that its name and title necessarily involve that proposition: It is "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

Let me ask you to consider the origin and significance of this name Protestant Episcopal. It had its origin in England, not in America. We find it in use in England as early as the year 1651, in Archbishop Bramhall's correspondence, more than one hundred and thirty years before its final adoption in the United States.

Now the genesis of the name is not far to seek. In the early part of the seventeenth century the Puritans put forth the claim that the polity laid down in the New Testament was Presbyterian. They asserted the divine right of Presbyterianism; whereupon the Church of England advocates asserted the counterclaim that the New Testament polity was Episcopal, not Presbyterian; but they hastened to explain that, though Episcopal, it was not Roman, but Protestant. And so naturally came into use the term "Protestant Episcopal," as a generic appellation descriptive of the Church of England. Now the literature of the period shows that this term "Protestant Episcopal" was used as a descriptive term, both in England and in the Colonies. Thus in 1782 Dr. Berkeley speaks of "the neglected sons of Protestant Episcopacy on the other side of the Atlantic." He speaks again of the "Protestant Episcopate," and of "Protestant Episcopalian principles," and of "American Protestant Episcopacy."

In 1783 the Primus of the Scotch Bishops speaks of "introducing Protestant Episcopacy into America," and he, remember, was the consecrator of Bishop Seabury. In the year 1800, by Act of Parliament, the Churches of England and Ireland were "united unto one Protestant Episcopal Church, to be called the united Church of England and Ireland." In America we find the same usage. The Church of England is described as a Protestant Episcopal Church

in instances too numerous to quote. Thus you see the name "Protestant Episcopal" was not invented in the Colonies; and the convention which adopted the name in 1785 did so after that name had been officially recognized in the Church in six of the seven states represented in the convention. They adopted no new name; they simply accepted the generic name that was current and described the Church as "the Protestant Episcopal Church *in the United States of America*" instead of "*in the Kingdom of Great Britain*." I should add that it was in use in Maryland as early as 1666.

3. I give a third reason for the affirmation that this Church is a Protestant Church, namely, the fathers and doctors of our American Church consistently and without exception known to me, recognized this Church as a Protestant Church from 1789 down to the period of the Oxford Tracts, about the middle of the nineteenth century. It is unnecessary to multiply quotations to this effect. Let one suffice. The able and learned Bishop John Henry Hopkins, of Vermont (*clarum et venerabile nomen*), himself a high churchman, wrote, in his famous charge, "The Novelties which disturb our Peace," issued in the year 1844: "This church is a reformed church . . . this church is a Protestant church; emphatically and distinctly such, because her duty to protest against error is in the nature of things inseparable from the right of *reformation*. This church is a Catholic church, that is, a branch of the ancient universal church of Christ, in contradistinction from all heresies and isms." The Protestant character of the Church was never denied, so far as I am aware, until the time of John Henry Newman, the famous Tractarian leader, who himself apostatized in due time to the Church of Rome.

4. I give a fourth reason for affirming the Protestant character of this Church. Aside from, and independent of the *name* of the Church, the *doctrines* embodied in the Prayer Book and the Articles of Religion are distinctly and emphatically Protestant. The word "Protestant" does not appear in the name of the Church of England; nevertheless, the Neo-Catholic Party in England speaks of that church as "a Communion deeply tainted with Protestant heresy." They also speak of "the standing disease of Protestantism in the Church of England." They also love to make their appeal, not to the Prayer Book as it is, but to the first Prayer Book of Edward VI's reign, when the Reformation was only in its first stages, and when, therefore, Protestantism did not find so full and distinct expression.

I ask you then to consider with me whether or not the Prayer Book of this Church and the Articles of Religion are, or are not, Protestant in character. Let us brush aside all the logomachy, and all the irrelevant arguments, with reference to the meaning of Protestant and Protestantism, and come to the gist and heart of the thing. Now as to what really matters we opine that *the Reactionary Party and the Prayer-Book Party are, after all, in essential agreement*. To us the word connotes the doctrine of justification by faith, and not by works; the absolute supremacy of the Holy Scriptures as the Rule of Faith; the one Mediatorship of Jesus Christ, to the exclusion of all saints and angels; the office of the ministers of Christ as His ambassadors, and representatives, as ministers of reconciliation, and not a sacrificing priesthood, not a sacerdotal caste, not an order of men standing between the people and Christ, as a necessary medium of communication with Him. It connotes also that the ordinance instituted by Christ on the last evening of His life is

the Lord's Supper, the Holy Communion, and not the sacrifice of the Mass, in which the priest makes a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men. Thus it connotes not only liberty of conscience, but the soul's right of direct access to Christ without the mediation of a priesthood. In a word, it means that system of primitive and Catholic truth which was reasserted in the English Reformation and embodied in the Liturgy and Articles of the English Church.

Now is it not clear that Protestantism, on its doctrinal side, means the same thing to the so-called "Catholic" party? Do they not reject most of these things which to us are connoted by the word, and do they not assert and practice their contraries?

The organ of that party has championed the following doctrines and practices—Sacramental Confession (that is, the Sacrament of Penance), the Objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Elements on the Altar, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Eucharistic Adoration, Reservation, Invocation of Saints, Seven Sacraments. All these things are openly professed and practised by the party, and all these things, without exception, were cast out of the English Liturgy and the English Standards of doctrine at the Reformation.

So then here the "Reactionary Party" and ourselves are really in agreement as to the doctrinal content of the word "Protestant." It means the affirmation of the doctrines which are challenged by the things above enumerated.

Now certainly there is strong presumptive evidence in favor of my contention to be found in the fact that both the decisions of the ecclesiastical courts of the Church of England and the teachings of the great Anglican divines for three hundred years are in favor of my view. But let us look at the matter with our own eyes.

(1) The Prayer Book is Protestant in its teaching, because it officially rejects the doctrine and practice of Sacramental Confession, that is, the Sacrament of Penance.

No
Confessional

In the first Prayer Book of Edward VI, 1549, "auricular and secret confession to the priest" was left optional, whereas in 1536 it had been enjoined as necessary. Then in 1552 Sacramental Confession was abolished entirely from the Prayer Book; nor was it ever restored in the subsequent revisions. If, then, having first made Sacramental Confession necessary, and having subsequently made it optional, and, last of all, having eliminated it entirely from the Prayer Book, it is evident that Sacramental Confession (as distinguished from occasional confession) is no longer lawful.

Observe also that our twenty-fifth Article teaches that "There are *two* Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord," and adds that Penance is not to be counted a sacrament of the Gospel. Once more in her Catechism the Church teaches that Christ has ordained two sacraments only. It has not a word to say about the Sacrament of Penance. Let me recall in this connection that Bishop Jeremy Taylor, in his chapter on Auricular Confession, says that there is in Holy Scripture "No mention of Sacramental Penance or Confession."

(2) Again the Prayer Book is Protestant because it rejects the doctrine of the Seven Sacraments, both in her Catechism and in her Articles. Here let me

Two Sacra-
ments Only

cite the language of the great Bishop Andrewes, who writes: "For more than a thousand years the number of Seven Sacraments was never heard of. How then can the belief in Seven Sacraments be 'Catholic,' which means always believed?"

(3) Again the Prayer Book is Protestant because it has substituted the Lord's Supper for the Mass. In the service books in use before the Reformation the title is "The Mass." Then in the first Prayer Book of 1549 the title was altered as follows:

The Mass
Abolished

"The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called The Mass." Then, in the revision of 1552, and again in that of 1558 and 1661, the name "Mass" was entirely omitted.

In the Catechism of the Church we have a complete exposition of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but not a word about the Mass. Again, in Article XXXI, the Church teaches that "the sacrifices of Masses . . . were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." The Mass, as everyone knows, was the pivot of the whole battle of the Reformation in England. The Reformers were burned at the stake because they repudiated the Mass. Archbishop Cranmer called it "the Devil's invention." Bishop Ridley used similar language; and Bishop Latimer said, "the Mass itself I utterly detest and abhor." The distinguishing feature of Queen Mary's accession in 1553 was the restoration of the Mass. A comparison between the Communion Office of the Church of England and the "Sarum Mass," which it replaced, shows that of forty-two statements in the "Sarum Mass," only eight were retained. And observe that whatever expresses the idea that there was in the Holy Communion a sacrifice or oblation for the sins of the people, is absolutely eliminated. In short, everything characteristic of the Mass as it was understood before the Reformation is abrogated in the Communion Office. Very little indeed of the "Sarum" office remains in our service; and that little is derived from a period anterior to medievalism. The rubrics, the Commandments, the Responses, the Offertory Sentences, the Exhortations, the

Invitation—"Ye that do truly repent, . . ." the Confession, the Comfortable Words, the Prayer of Humble Access, the Prayer for the Church Militant, the Prayer of Consecration, all were introduced by the Reformers. Thus the whole heart and substance of the old sacrifice of the Mass was abrogated in the English Communion Office.

(4) Again the Prayer Book is Protestant because it no longer contains the doctrine of the Objective Presence in the Elements. A comparison of the several revisions of the Prayer Book in 1549, 1552, 1558 and 1661, shows that language expressive of the idea that there was an objective presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the elements was first modified, and then completely altered, so as to eliminate that idea. Thus the first book taught that Christ "hath left in these holy mysteries . . . his own blessed Body and precious Blood."

But in the second book, and in the subsequent revisions, including that of 1661, the language is altered as follows: "holy mysteries, as pledges of his love, and for a continual remembrance of his death."

(5) Once more the Prayer Book is Protestant because it has officially rejected the Reservation of the Elements.

The practice of reservation was "officially rejected" by the adoption of the rubric which stands on p. 240 of our Prayer Book today, viz.:

"And if any of the consecrated Bread and Wine remain after the Communion, it shall not be carried out of the Church; but the Minister and other Communicants shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same."

If this rubric is obeyed there can be no reservation. That this is the doctrine of the Church has been publicly declared by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York (viz., Archbishops Temple and Maclagan), in a somewhat recent case

(A.D.1900), after long and exhaustive discussion and deliberation. Our own bishops had united in the same opinion in 1895.

(6) The Prayer Book is Protestant again because it rejects Eucharistic Adoration. As to this, it is sufficient

No Eucharistic
Adoration

to repeat the words of the rubric at the end of the Communion Office of the Church of England, adopted in its present form in 1661,

by Convocation: "It is hereby declared that thereby no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." Jeremy Taylor's language may here be recalled:

"They commit an act of idolatry in giving divine honor to a mere creature which is the image, the sacrament and representment of the body of Christ. . . . It is to be presumed that if it had been intended that we should worship the holy sacrament, the Holy Scripture would have called it God or Jesus Christ, and have bidden us in express terms to have adored it."

(7) Finally, the Prayer Book is Protestant because it rejects the Invocation of Saints. As to this, the Office of the

No Invocation
of Saints

"Sarum Mass" contains many instances of the invocation of the Virgin and the saints, all of which invocations are completely eliminated

from the Communion Office of the Church of England. Article XXII, p. 562, of our Prayer Book, condemns the Invocation of Saints as a "fond thing vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture."

II. I come now to my second proposition; this Church, which has been a Protestant Church since the middle of the sixteenth century, ought to continue Protestant.

Let the Church
Continue
Protestant

I agree with the late learned and saintly Bishop Ellicott that never was there a greater need

than now to emphasize our Protestant character. And for two reasons. First, because of the determined efforts of a more or less influential party within the Church to undo the work of the Reformation, and second, because of the unchanged character of the Roman Catholic Church, and its bold and aggressive attempts to bring this beloved land of ours under its sway, not only religiously but politically.

Is it necessary to prove the truth of the assertion that determined efforts are making to undo the work of the Reformation? To the proof then. One of the best-known representatives of the so-called Catholic Party in England, the Reverend Dr. Darwell Stone, declared in the Manchester Church Congress, a year or two ago, "with the fullest sense of responsibility," that the Church of England and the Church of Rome "held a common doctrine in regard to the Eucharist." Another clergyman of the Church of England declared a year or two ago that "the only safe position was to accept the whole Catholic faith, without which there could be no salvation." Proceeding, he thanked God "that the light of the Holy Catholic Church was now beginning to shine through the dark veil of heresy, which had affected the English Church for over three centuries." At the close of the discourse he publicly commended the members of the Catholic League to the Patronage of Our Lady, St. Joseph and St. Nicholas.

This may suffice for the Church of England. As to the Church in the United States, I need not cite instances in proof of my assertion, for in all our principal cities these Romanizing services are continually evident. He must be blind indeed who does not see a more or less influential party all over the Church in the United States endeavoring to bring back doctrines and practices which were thrown out and discontinued at the time of the Reformation. And they are doing this with a boldness unknown a generation ago. One of the

most influential of our Church papers, for example, publicly advocates the Invocation of Saints, the Doctrine of the Mass, the Reservation of the Sacrament, the Sacrament of Penance, Eucharistic Adoration and the Doctrine of Seven Sacraments.

In one of our great cities there is a Church of our communion which so exactly reproduces the Roman Catholic use that priests of that church, entering it, mistake it for one of their own.

In another large city a Service Book is used, which contains "Litanies to the Blessed Virgin" wherein we read:

"Holy Mary, Mother of our Creator, Pray for us." And again:

"Queen, conceived without original sin, Pray for us."

Consider also that "The Holy Cross Tracts" teaching these Roman doctrines have had a circulation during the last year of more than 100,000 copies. Is this then a time for us to give up our Protestant name or to lower our Protestant banner? Rather, let us nail it to the mast!

As to what I have asserted in regard to the Roman Catholic Church, you know as well as I that it boasts that it is always

The Roman Church Remains Unreformed the same, *semper eadem*, and no one can carefully study the state of that Church today without seeing it is every whit as superstitious, as unscriptural and as intolerant as it was at the time of the Reformation. Indeed, her departure from

the purity of the primitive faith is even greater now than then. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin had not then been proclaimed; and Mariolatry had not reached the blasphemous extreme that we witness today. Again, the infallibility of the Pope was not then the dogma of the church, binding upon all Roman Catholics as it is today. I know of no superstitious and unscriptural doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome in the sixteenth century

that is not asserted and practiced in our time. Even here in enlightened America the worship of relics exists, as in the case of an alleged bone of St. Anne, the mother of the Virgin, in a parish in Brooklyn; and the doctrine of indulgences, which fired the righteous indignation of Martin Luther, is preached in New Mexico, where people are promised an indulgence of millions of years if they use certain devotional manuals and recite a certain number of Ave Marias and Pater Nosters.

But a prominent advocate of the change of name tells us that Rome has become more truly Catholic through the general tendencies of American institutions—more comprehensive and more progressive.

This is not the opinion of leading men in the Church of Rome who are praying and laboring for reform in that Communion. M. Houton, for example, on his visit to America a few years ago said that "Roman Catholicism in this country was in almost primeval darkness." Similar was the opinion of that devout and able man, Father Tyrrell. And a recent Roman writer says that the attitude of the present Pope to Democracy, Freedom of the Intellect, and Freedom of Conscience is one of undisguised and bitter hostility, and if we should judge Roman Catholicism by the acts of its present rulers it would appear as the most decayed of all anachronisms or the most dangerous of all survivals.

In the face of all this it is strange indeed to read these words from the pen of the Bishop of Delaware: "If it comes to taking sides between Catholic Communions and Protestant, its principles [*i. e.*, those of the Anglican Church] place it on the side of the Catholics." The Bishop of Chicago uses similar language.

It may be granted, however, that the influence of Protestantism in the United States, as also in England, tends to

produce greater moral purity among the adherents of the Church of Rome. But does this circumstance absolve us from the necessity of maintaining our protest against the false, superstitious and idolatrous worship of that Church? Does the distinguished divine alluded to above forget that Rome is this very day, with brazen effrontery, enforcing her *ne temere* decree not only in Ireland and in England, but in America, declaring marriages made according to the law of the land, null and void, separating husbands and wives, taking children away from their parents? Is he ignorant of the bold avowals of Rome's representatives in America today—such as this from perhaps the most influential of her newspapers: "We have always defended the persecution of the Huguenots, and the Spanish Inquisition. When she [the Catholic Church] thinks it good to use physical force, she will use it." (*Western Watchman*, December 24, 1908.)

And can we forget the unspeakable arrogance of the Roman Cardinals in America? and the declared purpose of the hierarchy, at all hazards, "to make America Catholic"? And can we fail to see their insidious and determined efforts to gain political control in the United States? Again I say, is this the time for this Church of the martyrs, and of the Reformation, to lower its Protestant standard? No! What the times call for is the unification of the greater Protestant communions, in solemn witness to the great truths of the gospel and in determined opposition to the aggressions of the Church of Rome.

This great word Protestant, witnessing to Christian liberty, witnessing to those primitive and Catholic truths, which were reasserted by the Reformers, both on the Continent and in England, constitutes a sacred bond between the great Evangelical Churches of America and ourselves—those Churches which

embrace at least five-sixths of the Protestant world in this land, which are the chief moral sinew and strength of American civilization, which are the bulwarks of our country, against the aggressions of the Roman Catholic hierarchy—and which are doing such a magnificent missionary work in pagan lands.

Now we should refuse our consent to the proposal to strike out the word Protestant, should the effort be renewed, because it would mean nothing less than the severing of that bond between us and these great Protestant Churches. We believe, with absolute conviction, that the day that proposal should be carried into effect, the hands on the clock of Christian Unity would be put back a long, long way. But, please God, that day shall never come!

Let me now group together some of the objections which are urged to the continued use of the word Protestant:

(1) We are told that the word Protestant has changed its meaning since the sixteenth century, and, therefore, we ought to abandon it. What an argument is this! A great word is by some improperly used—is in popular parlance somewhat changed in its signification; therefore, we ought to abandon the *right* use of the word! Now we use the word in the sense in which it was used in the sixteenth century, in its historical sense, in its proper etymological sense, in the sense in which it is used at least five times in the Holy Scripture. They tell us that it is a word of division and strife and negation; that it connotes reckless and irresponsible individualism; a word that may mean a go-as-you-please religion, or no religion at all.

Nevertheless, it is a great and noble word. We are not ashamed of it. The Anglo-Catholic divines were not ashamed of it—Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Hall, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Archbishop Bramhall. Archbishop Benson was not ashamed

Protestant a
Noble Word

of it; that great scholar, the late Bishop Creighton of London, was not ashamed of it. It has a great history. It stands for illustrious achievement. It has been the fountain of liberty, of progress, of intellectual and spiritual enlightenment, and of missionary zeal. "A word of division indeed!" Why, it is the bond of union between twenty millions of Christians in our Fatherland! A word of negation, do they say? Why, it is one of the most positive and constructive words in the language! Its etymology and its history alike proclaim it such. It is older than the Reformation—older than the primitive Church. It came, as I have said, in Greek form from the lips of Jesus of Nazareth when, at Pilate's judgment seat, He said, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth."—John 18:37.

As I have already pointed out, the word Protestant is derived from the Latin "protestari," which means to bear solemn witness, the thing which our Lord told Pilate He came into the world to do, and which He did, both positively and negatively.

I repeat then, the word Protestant in the name of our Church has one definite meaning—its historical and doctrinal meaning in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Those who would abandon the word Protestant wish to insert the word Catholic. And yet this word "Catholic" has much more entirely changed its meaning since the sixteenth century. Today it means, as used by eight out of ten people in our country, the Church of Rome. The advocates of the Change of Name, however, do not use it in that sense. They claim the liberty of using it in an eclectic sense of their own, in what they would say is the true sense of the word.

In this connection I commend to our opponents a lesson to be learned from the early history of the Christian Church.

Students of that history will remember that the heathen antagonists of the Christians of the early ages attempted to hold them responsible for the opinions and practices of heretics, because they had in common with them the title of "Christian."

Lesson of
Early Church
History

This responsibility they indignantly refused to accept, because the heretics, though bearing the Christian name, were not really Christian.

Precisely on the same ground, we refuse responsibility for the vagaries and heresies of many in our time who are called Protestant. Unitarians and Christian Scientists and others may, in popular parlance, be called Protestants, but they are not really Protestants—they have no just claim to that great name.

(2) Again we are told that it is necessary to emphasize our claim to be a part of the Catholic Church, as if there was an inconsistency between the word Protestant

The Church
both Catholic
and Protestant

and the word Catholic. This is an entire mistake. The English Reformers declared that they had not abandoned the Catholic Church; that, in fact, it was necessary for them to become Protestant in order to preserve their Catholicity. To the Reformers of the sixteenth century, and to the divines in England in the seventeenth century, their Protestantism was an essential note of their Catholicity. As Dr. Newman Smyth has recently said, "the Reformers never regarded themselves as no longer belonging to, and believing in the Catholic Church. We would seek in our time to restore the word to its earliest and comprehensive significance; as Ignatius used it, 'where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church.' In that direction lies the way towards unity."

The distinguished advocate of the name American Catholic, to whom I have already more than once alluded, is very fond

of quoting from Dr. Newman Smyth's little book ("Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism"). Let me commend to him, and to those who think with him, the words of that distinguished author in a letter addressed to myself in October, 1914. He says: "An exclusive assumption of Catholicity, such as would be involved in the claim to be 'the American Catholic Church,' would certainly tend to isolate Episcopacy from all the rest of Protestantism." Again he says: "In our view the use of that word as a title would be unhistorical and schismatic."

(3) Again it is objected that the word Protestant is misleading, because it implies that the Anglican Church, of which ours is a branch, had its origin in the sixteenth century; and it is sought to confirm this opinion by quoting the definition of the word Protestant found in the Century Dictionary, namely, "a member, or an adherent, of one of those Christian bodies which are descended from the Reformation of the sixteenth century." And then it is urged that the Anglican Church did not *originate* in the sixteenth century, but in the City of Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost. (Note that the word "originate" is conveniently substituted for the word "*descended*.")

But the definition does not justify this argument. It declares that a Protestant is a member of one of those bodies which are *descended from the* Reformation of the sixteenth century. Certainly the Church of England today is a body which is descended from the Reformation of the sixteenth century. The Reformation may be called its grandfather. But a man is descended from his great-great-grandfather as well as from his grandfather; and, therefore, the Church of England is not only descended from the Reformation of the sixteenth century, but from the primitive Church planted

in Great Britain in the second or third century. I affirm therefore that the assertion of the Protestant character of our Church is not at all in conflict with her position as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ. The Anglican communion has ever held herself loyal to the Catholic faith, and has professed that she is a part of the Catholic Church. Her great divines and apologists have ever maintained that she stands on Catholic ground; that her faith is the Catholic faith; that her order is the Catholic order; that her liturgy is derived from Catholic sources; that her rites and ceremonies have been established upon Catholic principles. But in order to maintain these Catholic principles, it became necessary at the Reformation to purify the Church of the uncatholic doctrines and practices which in the course of ages had grown up. In other words, in order to remain Catholic, it was necessary for the Anglican Church to become Protestant.

But in acknowledging her to be Protestant we do not make her originate at the Reformation, any more than the adoption of the Nicene Creed made the Christian Church begin in the year 325. The Fathers of the fourth and succeeding centuries steadfastly professed the Nicene faith. That became the recognized test of orthodoxy. But did anybody on that account imagine that the Church had its origin in the fourth century and not in the first?

(4) Once more it is objected that Protestantism is decadent. The Reverend Dr. Wilmer, author of the prize essay on "Shall the Name of our Church be Changed"? told us a year or two ago that the several systems of Protestant theology are crumbling to pieces. He refers particularly to Calvinism and Arminianism. But does not the Doctor know that these systems of theology had their strong supporters in the Church of

Is
Protestantism
Decadent?

England as well as in the Nonconformist bodies—indeed, were supposed to be incorporated in our Articles—and will he tell us whether these systems are crumbling to pieces any faster in other Protestant Churches than they are in the Anglican Church?

Protestantism decadent? Protestantism crumbling and dying? Look at that rather recent anniversary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the marvellous work there reported! Look at the Edinburgh Missionary Conference, a few years ago, and the wonderful missionary work there reflected! Look at the "Men and Missions Movement" in the United States, inspired and fostered by Protestantism! Look at the "Men and Religion Movement," which followed in its wake, with its splendid inspiration and enthusiasm! Remember the convention gathered under its auspices in the City of New York in the spring of 1914. I attended that convention, and met an eminent clergyman of our Church, who was also in attendance, and he said to me, "*This is the greatest thing since Pentecost!*" and that clergyman was the Reverend Dr. Wilmer! Yet he was talking about "crumbling Protestantism!" Is there any better test of religious vitality and spiritual power than missionary zeal? And is it not a fact, mournfully admitted by even so high a churchman as Bishop Gore, that the other Protestant communions put us to shame by their missionary zeal and consecration? Let me recall the prophecy of the present Bishop of St. Albans, Dr. Jacobs, who recently declared his firm conviction that a hundred years hence India will be largely Christian, and that it will be mainly Christianized by the agency of Non-Episcopal Americans.

Look also at the immense intellectual output of the Protestant Church in England and America! Look at their enormous contributions to biblical scholarship! Look at

their great achievements in the cause of moral reform and social betterment!

(5) Once more it is urged that we cannot fulfil our mission as "the Church of the Reconciliation" if we continue to use our present title, "Protestant Episcopal." Dr. Church of the Reconciliation Wilmer quotes Dr. Newman Smyth as saying that "the Episcopal Church has, as no other, the opportunity and the call to become the mediating church among all the churches"; he also quotes Count de Maistre, a Roman Catholic of wide experience, as saying, "if ever Christians come together in that unity to which everything calls them, it would seem that the moving impulse must start from the Church of England."

Now is it not strange that Dr. Wilmer does not see that the Anglican Church has achieved this unique position of the Church of the Reconciliation, in this country under the Protestant name, and in England under the national name Church of England, without the word Catholic in its title? How then can it be claimed that the Protestant name is an obstacle to the fulfilment of her mission?

(6) But the most fatal objection to Protestantism is yet to be stated. It is that urged by the Bishop of Delaware and others of the pseudo-Catholic party, viz., that Protestantism necessarily tends to Unitarianism and infidelity; in fact, that "its goal is Atheism."

Is the Goal of Protestantism Atheism?

Now by what argument is that amazing proposition supported? By the awful example of Unitarianism and unbelief developed in Protestant Germany! The fact we need not deny. But what of the cause? Is it to be traced surely to the spirit of Protestantism? If so, to what cause are we to attribute the vast flood of unbelief that submerged

nearly the whole of France in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries? Did that proceed from Protestantism?

France was a Roman Catholic country. And who were the two men whose names represent the most powerful forces of unbelief in France in those two centuries? Surely Voltaire and Ernest Renan, the former carefully trained by the Jesuits, the latter destined for the priesthood and educated in the Seminary of Saint Sulpice in Paris under the eye of the Abbé Dupanloup.

The fact is, modern Europe is full of tragic examples of the triumph of unbelief which the historian is compelled to recognize as reactions from the superstition and doctrinal corruption of the Church of Rome.

But there is a yet more melancholy example of the failure of the Roman Catholic Church to preserve the purity of the faith and the pristine power of the Christian Religion.

It presented itself to my mind several years ago when I stood in the midst of the impressive ruins of old Panama on the shore of the Pacific Ocean. As I surveyed the crumbling remains of those once noble churches and monasteries and convents, I reflected that they antedated the English settlement of Jamestown, Virginia, by almost a hundred years. And then I asked myself the question, What has the Roman form of Christianity done for Central America, for Mexico, for the West Indies, for the vast continent of South America, in four hundred years of undisputed sway?

What a spectacle of irreligion and immorality and unbelief it presents today!

I hear Father Sherman declaring that he found Porto Rico a Catholic country, but without religion! I hear the Abbé Dominic, chaplain to the Emperor Maximilian, declaring that Mexican Christianity was "a baptized heathenism."

I hear Cardinal Vaughan saying of New Grenada, "the monks are in the lowest state of degradation, and the suppression of them would be an act of divine favor." I hear the Archbishop of Caracas and Venezuela exclaim, "Why does ignorance of religion continue to brutalize and degrade more and more these people? Why exist so many parishes which are true cemeteries of souls dead to God?" I hear the Roman Catholic Bishop of San Paolo lamenting, "Brazil has no longer any faith. Religion is almost extinct here."

And now, with these lamentations of devout Roman Catholic prelates and scholars in our ears, we turn to these bishops of our Church who point to the rationalism and unbelief in Prussia today as a proof that "the goal of Protestantism is Atheism," and demand of them whether they really would have us believe that the Roman Catholic cult is a sure preservative against unbelief and agnosticism?

Which is the more awful spectacle? Which exhibits the more utter and mournful failure? And if the former shows that "the goal of Protestantism is Atheism," what does the latter prove as to *the goal of Romanism*?

And now, in conclusion, let me say that we make no apology for the word Protestant. It is a great word and has a great history. It still stands for the same vital truths for which it stood in the sixteenth century. It is not a mere word of negation. It connotes positive truth. It signifies the definition of the Church as a witness-bearer, even as our Lord commanded, and as He said of Himself to Pontius Pilate. It stands for the witness of the Church of England for primitive and Catholic truth, and for her witness against the corruptions of doctrine which had come into the Church and been made part of the faith. It was accepted and gloried in by the

No Apology
for the Word
Protestant

Elizabethan divines, by the Caroline divines (the Anglo-Catholic divines), by the most illustrious divines of the Anglican Church throughout the nineteenth century, with very few exceptions. Oh, I see round its brow a halo of brilliant associations, which eclipses by far the pallid lustre of that pseudo-Catholicism of which we hear so much—with its diadem of false and unscriptural doctrines, and its gaudy robes of medieval ceremonialism!

We hold the word in the sense of our great theologians, just as we hold the word Catholic in its true sense, refusing to abandon it because nine out of ten in America today understand it to mean the Roman Church.

There is a true Catholicity and a false. Let me endeavor to discriminate between them.

Both turn to the past, aspiring to be in touch with the one Church once builded by the Lord, and to hold fast the one faith once delivered. But they are animated by a different spirit and they incarnate widely different ideas. Pseudo-Catholicity, in one of its forms, not content to establish and maintain continuity with the ages behind us, would imitate the past by a slavish conformity, bows down to it, is in bondage to it, looks back to it as the golden age, has no higher ideal than to reproduce it. In another form it turns indeed to the past, but not to the primitive past. It is in love with the Middle Ages; it almost obliterates the *antiquitatem* from the Vincentian Canon.

But true Catholicity seeks rather to understand the spirit of the past, and to learn how that spirit may be applied to the changed conditions of the world and of the Church. It would learn of the past all it can teach, but it would not bow down to it or be in bondage to it. It walks erect as the heir of the same promises and of the same Divine Guidance which the Fathers enjoyed. True Catholicity may be described,

not as a reproduction of the past, but as a living growth out of the past, incarnating the same immemorial principles, but in a new form adapted to its own day and generation. It remembers its obligations to the present as well as to the past. It would be a living organism, not a fossil. It would keep in touch with humanity, with the progress of man, with the new ideas of order and liberty, of social justice and human rights; because, though it recognizes the "fullness and beauty of the religious temper of past ages," it has "got rid of the dead hand," it does not allow "the freedom of the life of man in God to be smothered in the formularies and traditions of the past."

Let me say, then, both of these great words appeal to us with irresistible force. Because we are "Catholics," we must courageously defend the faith once delivered to the saints; and because we are "Protestants," we must ever reassert the primitive truths of Christianity, vindicate them from medieval corruptions, assert the liberty of conscience and the freedom of the Episcopate.

Both as Catholics and as Protestants we are in duty bound to contend earnestly for the faith, to watch over its purity, to summon our people ever back to the primitive standards of belief and practice; to uphold the freedom of conscience and the independence of the Episcopate and to urge upon our fellow citizens the application of the principles of Christianity to the problems of the time—to the cleansing of Government and the purification of morals.

We plead for a large conception of the function of the Church in modern society, and I appeal to my fellow churchmen who have become restive under the present name of the Church to unite with us in a mighty effort to prove our Catholicity, not by a change of the title page of the Prayer Book or the name of the Church, but by a truly Catholic